



City of Seattle

---

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor  
**Department of Planning and Development**  
D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE**  
**ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF**  
**THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

**Application Number:** 2409349  
**Applicant Name:** Glen MacDonald  
**Address of Proposal:** 425 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue East

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION**

Council Land Use Action to Rezone 43,223 square feet of land from Single Family 5000, single family to a multifamily zone, Lowrise Two. Property is bounded by an alley to the west, 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue East to the east, East Republican to the north, and East Harrison to the south.

The following approvals are required:

**Rezone** - To rezone from SF5000 to L2 - Seattle Municipal Code 23.34  
**SEPA - Environmental Determination** - Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05.

**SEPA DETERMINATION:** ☐ Exempt ☒ DNS ☐ MDNS ☐ EIS

☐ DNS with conditions

☐ DNS involving non-exempt grading, or demolition, or another agency with jurisdiction.

**BACKGROUND**

Site and Vicinity Description

The subject rezone site includes five parcels totaling approximately 43,223 square feet along 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue East between East Republican Street on the north, East Harrison Street on the south and an

alley parallel to 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. on the west. Three parcels front 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. A fourth and a fifth parcel face E. Republican and E. Harrison Streets respectively. Three of the parcels house multi-family structures. The other two have single family houses. The multi-family buildings include a three story, 27-units structure at the corner of 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. and E. Republican St.; a five-story, 20-unit building mid-block on 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E., and a one story, five-unit structure at the corner of 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. and E. Harrison St. Parcel sizes range from 1,845 square feet to 16,200 square feet. Across the alley to the west, seven parcels contain one single family, three duplexes, two four-plexes and a thirteen unit apartment building. On the east side of 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. a single family house and a 15-unit apartment building (# stories) faces the subject rezone site. The Miller Community Center and playfield extends roughly 790 feet along 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. to East Thomas St. The community center complex totals 7.6 acres. Meany Middle School comprises an additional 4.1 acres.

The city of Seattle designated the full block between 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Avenues and E. Harrison and E. Republican Streets as Single Family 5000 (SF 5000). To the east, the Miller Community Center and Meany Middle School complex possess a SF 5000 zone classification. To the west and south, single family zoning also prevails. To the north and northeast across E. Republican St. and 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E, the zoning changes to a three block enclave of Neighborhood Commercial One with a 40 foot height limit (NC1 40) and Lowrise One and Two (L1, L2). The nine parcels of L2 at the southeast corner of the E. Republican and 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. intersection total approximately .78 acres.

The zoning pattern of the larger vicinity shows predominantly single family zoning surrounding a small nucleus of neighborhood commercial and Lowrise zones between East Roy Street and E. Republican St. along 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. A significant shift in the zoning occurs two blocks to the south (to mostly Lowrise Three) and 2 ½ blocks to the west (neighborhood commercial and L3). Although a prominent arterial, 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. does not serve as a transition or buffer between zones. Rather three small clusters of Lowrise and Neighborhood Commercial zoning occur at separate nodes north of E. Thomas St. The node between E. Republican and E. Roy St. is the largest among them.

The territory of the subject rezone has been designated entirely Single Family 5000 since 1986. Previous to 1986, the northern quarter was classified as Intermediate Business (Bi), a commercial designation. The southern three-fourths of the block were RS 5000 and RM 800, both residential zones, since 1959.

### Proposal Description

The applicant proposes to rezone five parcels on the west side of 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. between E. Republican St. and E. Harrison St. from Single Family 5000 to Lowrise Two. One of the parcels fronts on to E. Harrison St. Another parcel fronts onto both 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. and E. Harrison St. with its garage facing 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. An alley separates the subject rezone from parcels facing 18<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. The proponent, who controls just one (5,400 square feet) of the five parcels, would be able potentially to redevelop his site with four residential units, an increase of three units. Two other parcels, if redeveloped, would have gains of one to two units. The two remaining parcels, which now house more units than allowed in the land use code, would not gain potential units from the proposed rezone.

### Public Comments

The Department of Planning and Development received two comment letters. One letter objected to the rezone of the half block citing reduction of light and elimination of trees and open space. The other letter supported the rezone for the applicant's property alone and not for the other four properties affected by the proposal. The writer stated that the applicant's characterization of the block did not fully describe the area. Two of the five affected properties are effectively on Harrison St. "One is a single family residence and one is a low-slung, single story set of five apartments that looks more like a single family structure than a low-rise."

### ANALYSIS – REZONE

Seattle Municipal Code section 23.34.007 and the following sections set forth the criteria for rezone application evaluation. The provisions shall be weighed and balanced together to determine which zone or height designation best meets those provisions. Zone function statements shall be used to assess the likelihood that the area proposed to be rezoned would function as intended. No single criterion or group of criteria shall be applied as an absolute requirement or test of appropriateness of a zone designation, nor is there a "hierarchy of priorities" for rezone considerations, unless a provision indicates the intent to constitute a requirement or sole criterion.

### General Rezone Criteria

General rezone criteria are set forth in Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 23.34.008. Subsection SMC 23.34.008.B states as follows: "The most appropriate zone designation shall be that for which the provisions for designation of the zone type and locational criteria for the specific zone match the characteristics of the area to be rezoned better than any other zone designation."

Specific rezone criteria are discussed below as relevant to the proposed action.

### Urban Village or Urban Center Zoned Capacity (SMC 23.34.008A).

The subject site is located within the Madison-Miller Residential Urban Village. In urban centers, in order for a rezone to be approved: "The zoned capacity for the center or village taken as a whole shall be no less than one hundred twenty-five percent (125%) of the growth targets adopted in the Comprehensive Plan for that center or village."

As stated in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan Urban Village Policy UV 42, growth targets are based on zoned capacity for development within urban centers, and are not to exceed 80 percent of that capacity (since development at 100 percent of capacity is not likely to be achieved.). This same concept, expressed in the code, states that zoned capacity must be at least 125 percent of the adopted growth target (i.e.,  $1.25 \times 80 = 100$ ). The adopted growth targets for the Madison-Miller Residential Urban

Village are found in Urban Village Appendix A of the Comprehensive Plan. These targets call for an increase of 500 additional households by the year 2024, and an increase in household per acre density from the current 6 to 17. Because these growth targets are not yet met and the proposed rezone from SF 5000 to L2 helps to meet these targets, Criterion A is met.

Match between Zone Criteria and Area Characteristics (SMC 23.34.008.B)

Per this code section: *“The most appropriate zone designation shall be that for which the provisions for designation of the zone type and the locational criteria for the specific zone match the characteristics of the area to be rezoned better than any other zone designation.”*

**Single Family Locational Criteria**

Locational criteria for single family zones are found at SMC 23.34.011.B. Per this code section, *“A single-family zone designation is most appropriate in areas meeting the following criteria:*

- 1. Areas that consist of blocks with at least seventy (70) percent of the existing structures in single-family residential use;”*

The terms “block” and “block front” are defined in the Land Use Code at SMC 23.84.004 “B.” According to these definitions: “. . . a block consists of two facing block fronts bounded on two sides by alleys or rear property lines and on two sides by the centerline of platted streets, with no other intersecting streets intervening.” Block front means: “. . . the frontage of property along one side of a street bound on three sides by the centerline of platted streets and on the fourth side by an alley or rear property lines.”

Based on this definition, the relevant block comprises the block front including the subject rezone and the block front along 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. extending from E. Republican St. to E. Thomas St. Just three of the eight structures on the block are considered single family, less than the 70 percent defining this specific criterion. Thus, the block does not meet the single family criteria.

- 2. Areas that are designated by an adopted neighborhood plan as appropriate for single-family residential use;”*

The property is designated as part of the Madison-Miller Residential Urban Village in Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan. It has been mapped as single family residential in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map. Planning efforts in the neighborhood, including the 1998 ordinance #119216 which incorporated portions of the Central Area Action Plan II amending the City’s Comprehensive Plan, have shown the site zoned as single family residential.

The neighborhood plan maps the proposed rezone area Single Family 5000. The policies make no direct reference to the specific proposed rezone area. Discussion of the Madison-Miller area in the Central Area Action Plan does indicate a desire to rezone a Lowrise 3 area to Neighborhood Commercial Two with a forty foot height limit (NC2 40) zone on portions of 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. north of Madison to extend the commercial zone on 19<sup>th</sup> towards the NC1 area at 19<sup>th</sup> and Mercer. The Central Area Approval and Adoption Matrix endorses the creation of an NC2-40 zone on 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E.

north of Madison on land currently zoned L3. There is no discussion in the neighborhood plan to rezone any of the single family zones along the 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. corridor. The criterion is met.

3. *Areas that consist of blocks with less than seventy (70) percent of the existing structures in single-family residential use but in which an increasing trend toward single-family residential use can be demonstrated: for example:*
  - a. *The construction of single-family structures in the last five (5) years has been increasing proportionately to the total number of constructions for new uses in the area, or*
  - b. *The area shows an increasing number of improvements and rehabilitation efforts to single family structures, or*
  - c. *The number of existing single-family structures has been very stable or increasing in the last five (5) years, or*
  - d. *The area's location is topographically and environmentally suitable for single-family residential development."*

Evidence:

- No single family construction has occurred in the past five years.
- DPD permit records show that one of the three houses had an expansion and alteration since 1994.
- The number of single family structures has remained stable.
- The area is suitable for single family residential development.

There is no trend or pattern showing strong interest in repairing or building new single family structures in the area. In part, there are no vacant lots and little economic incentive to demolish a single family or multifamily structure for more single family units. One of the two single family lots is quite small (1,845 square feet); upzoning the property would potentially cause the site to lose development potential due to more stringent requirements (e.g. lot coverage) for lowrise zones. The area, however, is topographically and environmentally suitable for single family residential development. On one hand, there is not an increasing trend toward single family residential use because there are little or no opportunities. On the other hand, the location is topographically and environmentally suitable for single family use if the land were available.

In summary, while Criterion 1 is not met, Criterion 2 is met based on the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map. Criterion #3 remains inconclusive. Therefore, it can be argued that at least one of the criteria is met.

Per SMC 23.34.010, single family zoned areas may be rezoned to zones more intense than single-family 5000 only if the applicant can demonstrate that the area does not meet the criteria for single family designation (or meets an exception from this requirement.). In this case, it appears that the criteria for single family zoning are met but not convincingly. Due to the small number of single family residences in contrast to multifamily units, it is worthwhile to review the Lowrise Two locational criteria to determine

whether the rezone area presents a more convincing argument for the applicant's proposal for a Lowrise Two designation.

### **Lowrise Two Locational Criteria**

L2 locational criteria are found in SMC 23.34.018.B. The criteria are termed "Development Characteristics of the Area" and "Relationship to the Surrounding Areas."

#### **Development Characteristics of the Area**

Per SMC 23.34.018.B.1, Lowrise 2 zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:

- a. *Areas that feature a mix of single family structures and small to medium multifamily structures generally occupying one or two lots, with heights generally less than 30 feet;*
- b. *Areas suitable for multifamily development where topographic conditions and the presence of views make it desirable to limit height and building bulk to retain views from within the zone;*
- c. *Areas occupied by a substantial amount of multifamily development where factors such as narrow streets, on-street parking congestion, local traffic congestion, lack of alleys and irregular street patterns restrict local access and circulation and make an intermediate intensity of development desirable.*

The subject rezone area and surrounding blocks to the north, west and south have a mix of single family and small to medium multifamily structures. Located on the eastern slope of Capital Hill and given its historic mixture of structures, the area is topographically suitable for multifamily development. The organization of the street grid, the presence of a useable alley, and the lack of local traffic congestion does not preclude a higher intensity of use but neither does it suggest that L2 is more appropriate than other zones (LDT, L1, and L3) with intermediate intensities of development.

#### **Relationship to the Surrounding Areas**

- a. *Properties that are well-suited to multifamily development, but where adjacent single family structures make a transitional scale of development desirable. It is desirable that there be a well-defined edge such as an arterial, open space, change in block pattern, topographic change or other significant feature providing physical separation from the single family area. However, this is not a necessary condition where existing moderate scale multifamily structures have already established the scale relationship with abutting single family areas;*
- b. *Properties that are definable pockets within a more intensive area, where it is desirable to preserve a smaller scale character and mix of densities;*

- c. *Properties in areas otherwise suitable for higher density multifamily development but where it is desirable to limit building height and bulk to protect views from uphill areas or from public open spaces and scenic routes;*
- d. *Properties where vehicular access to the area does not require travel on “residential access streets” in less intensive residential zones.*

The rezone area lacks a well defined edge marking any distinction from the areas to the west and south. With the exception of the community center across the street to the east, the subject rezone area’s mix of single family and multifamily structures closely resembles its surrounding blocks. An important consideration is whether the rezone area has distinctive qualities and characteristics from the blocks to the west and south to warrant a rezone. The presence of a collector arterial, 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E., could suggest a reason to rezone blocks connecting higher intensity zones south of E. Thomas St. to the commercial and multifamily nodes further north. However, no city policy articulated in the Comprehensive Plan or Future Land Use map indicates that 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. should be a multifamily or commercial corridor. Rather these documents attempt to preserve the small nodes of higher intensity uses and do not attempt to expand them.

Neither does the subject rezone area resemble a definable pocket within a more intensive area. It closely resembles the blocks to the south and to the west. The zoning cluster of L2, NC2 and L1 across the street and to the north also appears similar. However, the argument to rezone the nearly one acre area to function similarly to the higher intensity cluster is not any more convincing since there is no background of planning efforts or policy by the city to rezone it. It can be argued that a rezone to L2 should be part of a larger policy to create a commercial/multifamily corridor along 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E.

Were this area rezoned to L2, access, according to the land use code, would occur on the alley, requiring limited amounts of travel on “residential access streets” in less intensive residential zones.

#### Zoning History and Presidential Effect (SMC 23.34.008.C)

Previous and potential zoning changes both in and around the area proposed for rezone are to be considered.

The territory of the subject rezone has been designated entirely Single Family 5000 since 1986. Previous to 1986, the northern quarter was classified as Intermediate Business (Bi), commercial designation. The southern three-fourths of the block were RS 5000 and RM 800, both residential zones, since 1959. Between 1923 and 1959, the entire proposed rezone block face was zoned Business-Commercial.

#### Neighborhood Plans (SMC 23.34.008.D)

The current Neighborhood Planning Element of Seattle Comprehensive Plan for the Central Area neighborhood was adopted in 1998 by Ordinance 119216. The subject rezone area is identified as being located within the Madison-Miller Residential Urban Village in the Comprehensive Plan. Nothing in the goals and policies of the Neighborhood Planning Element addresses rezoning of these parcels along the 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. corridor. The Future Land Use Map indicates that the subject area is within a single family zone. A rezone to the more intensive L2 zone is not consistent with adopted Neighborhood Plan for the Central Area and specifically for the Madison-Miller Residential Urban Village.

Compliance with Zoning Principles (SMC 23.34.008.E)

Subsection (E) of SMC 23.34.008, regarding Zoning Principles calls for consideration of the following issues:

- 1. The impact of more intensive zones on less intensive zones or industrial and commercial zones on other zones shall be minimized by the use of transitions or buffers, if possible. A gradual transition between zoning categories, including height limits, is preferred.*

A Single Family 5000 zone lies across the alley from the proposed rezone area. The seven structures have a total of 28 units ranging from one single family house to a 13 unit apartment. Potential impacts of the proposed rezone would likely affect the residents of these buildings. Impacts may include among others increased vehicular use of the alley; obstruction of light and air, and reduced amounts of open space. An alley is generally an adequate buffer between residential uses that have different densities. DPD would not suggest establishing curb cuts along 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. to avoid impacts on the alley.

The Miller Community Center lies to the east of the subject rezone area. It is unlikely that the addition of a potential six units would have much impact on the community center or Meany Middle School. The proposed rezone area, however, would separate two Single Family 5000 zones.

- 2. Physical buffers may provide an effective separation between different uses and intensities of development. The following elements may be considered as buffers: (a) natural features such as topographic breaks, lakes, rivers, streams, ravines and shoreline; (b) freeways, express ways, other major traffic arterials, and railroad tracks; (c) distinct change in street layout and block orientation; (d) open space and green spaces.*



The proposed rezone area lies at a significantly higher grade than the Miller Community Center. The difference amounts to 18 feet and higher according to DPD's GIS maps. The hill creates a slight buffer to the west but intensifies the edge to the east. Along with the buffer created by 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E., the separation between the subject area and the community center is considerable. E. Harrison Street does not meet the criteria of a major traffic arterial. The 16 foot alley separating the proposed rezone area from the neighboring Single Family 5000 is not considered an effective buffer based on this criterion. The area also lacks distinct changes in street layout and block orientation. No formal open or green spaces separate the two areas.

3. *Zone boundaries: (a) in establishing boundaries the following elements shall be considered: (1) physical buffers as described in subsection E (2) above; (2) platted lot lines.*

The location of proposed zone boundaries is consistent with the center line of the rights-of-way.

4. *In general, height limits greater than 40 feet should be limited to urban villages.*

The base height limit of the proposed L2 zone is 25 feet with an additional ten feet allowed for pitches roofs. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

#### Impact Evaluation (SMC 23.34.008.F)

*The evaluation of a proposed rezone shall consider the possible negative and positive impacts on the area proposed for rezone and its surroundings.*

1. *Factors to be examined include, but are not limited to, the following:*

- a. *Housing, particularly low-income housing;*

Although no development is proposed as part of this rezone application, the applicant has indicated that future redevelopment is likely on the parcel controlled by him. The proposed rezone from SF 5000 to L2 would allow additional housing units to be built, as follows. Under the current single family zoning, only one dwelling unit is generally allowed per development site. Under the proposed L2 zoning, the density limit would increase to one dwelling unit per 1,200 sq. ft. of lot area. Redevelopment with increases in unit density could potentially occur on three parcels. A total increase of six units is possible for the subject rezone area. Currently, two parcels have more units than legally allowed under the current land use code.

- b. *Public services;*

Additional residential units made possible by this proposed rezone would potentially require additional public services than otherwise would be expected by the lesser number of units possible under the

existing zoning. These services, electric, water, sewage, emergency services, would not be great in amount and would be in an amount which would likely be provided with current capacities.

- c. *Environmental factors, such as noise, air and water quality, terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna, glare, odor, shadows, and energy conservation;*

An increase in density would not have significant environmental impacts.

- d. *Pedestrian safety;*

Potential redevelopment of any of the parcels should have vehicular access from the alley rather than the creation of curb cuts on the perimeter streets. This should enhance pedestrian safety. The three perimeter streets all have sidewalks.

- e. *Manufacturing activity;*

There are no manufacturing activities in the area.

- f. *Employment activity;*

The proposed rezone would be expected to have very little long-term impact on employment activity in the area.

- g. *Character of areas recognized for architectural or historic value;*

There is no known applicability of this provision to this proposal.

- h. *Shoreline view, public access and recreation.*

There is no known applicability of this provision to this proposal.

- 2. *Service Capacities. Development which can reasonably be anticipated based on the proposed development potential shall not exceed the service capacities which can reasonably be anticipated in the area, including:*

- a. *Street access to the area;*
- b. *Street capacity in the area;*
- c. *Transit service;*
- d. *Parking capacity;*
- e. *Utility and sewer capacity;*

The proposal site has approximately 365 feet of street frontage along 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. The parcel configuration provides more than adequate opportunity to access the public street system. As discussed above, the property is located within walking distance of transit. It is also located within the Madison-

Miller Residential Urban Village, which is intended to accommodate an additional 500 households over the next twenty years (based on 2004 numbers) per the Comprehensive Plan.

No negative effect is anticipated from the proposed rezone. Existing capacities of utility and sewer services in the area can accommodate the proposed residential uses.

*f. Shoreline navigation.*

Not applicable.

Changed Circumstances (SMC 23.34.008.G)

*Evidence of changed circumstances shall be taken into consideration in reviewing proposed rezones, but is not required to demonstrate the appropriateness of a proposed rezone. Consideration of changed circumstances shall be limited to elements or conditions included in the criteria for the relevant zone and/or overlay designations in this chapter.*

No significant change in circumstances has occurred in the subject rezone area. Permitting history shows only one permit for electrical work among the five parcels.

Overlay Districts (SMC 23.34.008.H)

*If the area is located in an overlay district, the purpose and boundaries of the overlay district shall be considered.*

The subject site is not located in an overlay district, per SMC Chapter 23.71.

The subject site is also located within the Madison-Miller Residential Urban Village, as discussed elsewhere in this analysis.

Critical Areas (SMC 23.34.008.I.)

*If the area is located in or adjacent to a critical area (SMC Chapter 25.09), the effect of the rezone on the critical area shall be considered.*

The property is not located in or adjacent to an Environmentally Critical Area.

RECOMMENDATION – REZONE

The proposed area for rezone from SF 5000 to L2 closely resembles the surrounding blocks and overall contributes to the neighborhood's urban character. The variations in the immediate vicinity occur to the east with its cluster of community center, school and open space and to the north where small scale commercial and retail services are introduced across E. Republican St. On the whole, the mix of

single family and multifamily structures is seamless within the surrounding neighborhood and this includes the subject rezone area. To the casual observer, the rezone area is indistinguishable from its neighboring blocks, particularly to the west, south and northwest.

The owners of the five parcels within the subject area lack unanimity on the rezone. Although this is not a requirement or a criterion for a rezone, just two of the property owners expressed unqualified support in written statements for the rezone. The applicant has proposed a rezone that includes a larger area than his own mid-block parcel in order to better meet rezone criteria. With the urging of DPD, the applicant personally contacted the neighbors by letter. Of the three property owners favorable to the rezone, the applicant has the most to gain by the potential increase of three units on the parcel.

The neighborhood planning process and the City Council has had opportunities to reconsider the zoning of this area and has chosen not to increase the residential density along 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. Although it appears that the five parcels comprising nearly one acre resembles a lowrise zone, it also meets a key criteria for a single family zone. A rezone for this block face could be placed in a larger context that reconsiders the zoning policy along the 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. E. corridor in the Miller-Madison Residential Urban Village through a future update to the neighborhood plan.

The Director recommends **DENIAL** of this rezone petition.

### **ANALYSIS - SEPA**

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant, dated May 17, 2005, and annotated by the Department. The information in the checklist, supplemental information provided by the applicant, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with review of same project form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, certain neighborhood plans, and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority.

The Overview Policy states in part: "where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" (subject to some limitations). Under certain limitations and/or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

### **Short-term Impacts**

Although no development of the site is proposed, the rezone would allow construction of up to six dwelling units on the subject parcels. On that basis, the following temporary or construction-related

impacts are expected with future development: decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and nonrenewable resources. These impacts are expected to be very minor in scope and of very short duration. Therefore, no conditioning pursuant to SEPA policies is warranted.

#### Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal. Increasing the potential density of the rezone area from 54 dwelling units to 60 may result in increased height, bulk and scale, increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the area, increased demand for parking, increased light, glare and noise, and increased demand for public services and utilities. Most of these impacts will be minor and do not warrant any SEPA mitigation; however, bulk and scale, and impacts on pedestrian safety could be adverse, but would be sufficiently mitigated pursuant to SEPA authority by requirements in the land use code.

**DECISION - SEPA**

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

[X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.

[ ] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ (signature on file) Date: August 3, 2006  
Bruce Rips, Senior Land Use Planner  
Department of Planning and Development

BPR:bg

I:\RIPSB\REZONE\DEC\ 2409349.doc